

17654
CERTAIN
QUERES

Modestly (though plainly)
Propounded to such as affect the
Congregational-way,

And specially
To Master *Samuel Eaton* and
Mr. *Timothy Taylor*.

WITH AN
EPISTLE

Also directed to them
Concerning their late Book Intituled
A Defence of sundry Positions, &c.

BY
Richard Hollinworth, Mancunienfis.

*You shall not turn aside to the right hand, or to the left. Deut. 5.
If they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them,
Isai. 8. 20.
If the light that is in thee be darknesse, how great is that darknesse? Matth. 6.*

London, Printed by *Ruth Raworth* for *Thomas Smith*, and are to
be sold at his Shop in *Manchester*. 1646.

NEATNESS

2

(1991-1992) 1991-1992



THE EPISTLE.

Reverend and beloved Brethren,



Have perused your *defence* lately Printed (which how able or unable to justify *Independency*, or to vindicate the *Positions* and *Scriptures*, time may discover.) At present I have these few things to advertise you of.

First, you charge me with *provoking you to be my Antagonists in Print*^a; from which, I was so far, that when others (rather than my self) thought fit the *Examination of sundry Scriptures, &c.* (which for the most part was an Answer to some *Allegations*, as they were privately made to me for satisfaction) should be Printed, I gave special charge that neither my own name, nor the name of *Manchester*,

^a In the Epistle.

The Epistle.

chester, much lesse the name of other persons and places should be inserted at length, in, or before the Book (though some few Copies came out otherwise) lest I should seem either to provoke persons, or reveal secrets. .

The deep and heavy charge (as you call it b) in the first part of my Preface against *mis interpretation of Scripture, as abelying of God, counterfeiting the King of Kings hand, &c.* (Though I now see how I have sped) I repent not of, nor see I cause why you should repine at it, or complain of it, if you have *clearly manifested* (as in your Title page you say you have) *the Positions and Scriptures* alleaged for your Churchway, and by me examined, *to be sufficient, pertinent, and full of power.*

And yet I finde my self deeply and heavily charged by you, *To deprave places, to blots and blur sweet humble spirited, holy pertinent expressions, to wrong the Elders of N. E. to wrest allegations, &c.* Yea, though I said, I will not tell you who said *All the Church is holy, ye take too much upon you* : Yet you think it not unworthy my serious consideration, Whether it might not be said to me, as sometimes Christ said to one of the twelve, when he asked, Master *Is it I*, and he answered *Thou hast said c*, (a bitter personal invective) What is your *beloved brother*, your *good brother*, as a *Judas* or *Corah*, *Dathan*, &c ? I hope in this (to say no more) we neither are, nor shall be Brethren, and desire an humble modest Christian Contestation with you, which are (in your own phrase) *my Antagonists in Print* in this grave controversie; and withall calmly to consider (what I spake in relation to
your

^c Psa. 85.
35.

your cause, not to any person) whether investing non-Elders with Ministerial power, placing Church power in the body of the Congregation, and complaining of the Elders that rule over them in the Lord, for taking too much upon them, be not the gain-saying of *Corah*, a sin of the new as well as of the old Testament? Whereof if I be guilty, I justly bear this reproach; if not, you have much wronged me; but God hath sent you to do it, from whom I deserve much worse, though not from you any evil.

The usual occasion of your censures of depraving places, &c. is a wide (I hope) not a willing mistake in you, and not any iniquity in my hands or heart. You expect the Positions and Scriptures alleaged, to agree fully and exactly with the places cited in the Margent, which I neither professed, nor intended, nor could effect without some (in mine opinion unfitting) alterations of them as they were alleaged to me. But on the contrary for evidence, that I followed another rule then the Printed Books (as at the first coming out of my Book, I advertised one of your Brethren) I sometimes alleaged no Book at all, even where you know I might as *Pos. 4*. Other times, that by comparing Arguments that otherwise came to hand with the Printed Books, I might probably intimate from whence they were taken, and also evidence the truth of what I said in my *Preface*, *That Independency for the most part produceth the same Texts in Print, which she did in Preaching, Writing and Conference*. I alleaged Printed Books the *By-standers* mentioned in the *Preface* with these or the like

See your own Defence, p. 1, 13, 14, 46, 78, 90. clauses. See almost the same Argument verbatim. The like you have. This though not so fully. This seems to be taken out of. These Scriptures are alleaged though not with such tartnesse, &c. And sometimes I alleaged for one Position (the second for example) two or three Printed Books, differing possibly more then in phrase one from another, which are so evident signes, that I tyed not my self to the Printed Books, that I cannot but wonder that you did not observe it, which had you done, you needed not to have fought so earnestly and frequently with your own fiction; for if it be acknowledged that the Scriptures alleaged witnesse no such thing as they are produced for, (whether they be in Printed Books or no) I (as I told you in my Preface) have my full end.

You have also either to bring an odium upon me, or the cause I plead, sprinkled here and there, both unlovingly and unnecessarily some secret intimations of affecting Prelacy, whereas I in the worst times was not so much, or no more Prelatical then the greatest and godliest Independents in the Kingdom, if not at least one of you have been (though what ever I was or am, that is no Answer to my Arguments) nor do I plead the cause of Prelacy which we have Covenanted to endeavour to the utmost to extirpate: But of the Government of the Reformed Churches which we have Covenanted to defend against the common enemy, maintained by godly, learned men, our betters, known opposers of Prelacy, which have obtained a good report in Manchester, and the parts about it, viz. Master Burn of Manchester, Master Gosael of Boulton, Master Fleetwood of Wigan, both Master Midley's of Rachdal,

The Epistle.

7

Rachdal, Master Storer of Stockport, Master Hildersham of Ashby, Master Herring of Skrowesbury, Master Ball of Whitmore, Master John Paget (to omit his Brother Master Thomas Paget, and multitudes of others now alive) Master Hunt of Oldham, Master Rathband of Cockey, Master Gee of Newton, Master Tilecoat of Stretford, &c.

Nor is the Presbyterian-way, a Prelatical-way, but a Social-way, as between Friends, Colleagues, Confederates, Brethren; where all judge, and all are judged, all things done *communi consilio*; where no Congregation is above another Congregation, no Minister above another Minister; though the major part of them (*as of the spirits of the Prophets to the prophets*, and of Congregational Members, though equal one to another) be about the minor part; where every Elder is left to enjoy the Office of an Elder, and each Congregation left to the freedom of the Congregation, in what belongs to them, and they able to perform; where Presbyteries Classes, Synods of the same Congregations, or their Commissioners in matters of common concernment, do strengthen and help particular Congregations, walking according to the rule, and reduce such as walk not in truth and peace, but are leavened with error and variance; and Elders upon a call, do teach, and rule, and perform all Ministrations with reference to, and the best advantage of the whole Church of Christ, though more specially of those parts of it, to which they are most related.

Also, I cannot but observe, that there is a difference between your Title-page, in which you say
in-

The Epistle.

indefinitely, That the *Positions and Scriptures* alleaged (not some or many of them) by me examined, are *sufficient, pertinent, and full of power*, and are *manifested*, yea, *clearly manifested* so to be; and some other passages in your Book, in which you disclaim the places applied to *Pos. 23.* as it is by me controverted, and are confident they are not found in the Works of any Congregational man^d. And *Pos. 15.* after the Allegation of some Authorities, in stead of answering a Text (upon which, the distinction of *Pastors and Teachers* is grounded) you the one, a *Teacher*, and the other *Pastor*, conclude, *If we do put a false glosse upon the Scripture, by mis-interpreting of Ephes. 4. 11. yet more modest language* (let any man finde immodestly in that examination, if he can) *had become you brother, seeing such Reverend and Learned men, whom your self so much honour, have gone before us in this Exposition*. So *Pos. 19.* do you *clearly manifest*, or so much as assert, that the Text *Matth. 18.* (what ever other Texts do) doth prove, That the Church must be Congregational. *Pos. 20.* have you *clearly manifested* that *Matth. 16.* proves that the *Keys were given to Peter to be used by him* (for you could not but know that to be the meaning) as a *Disciple or Beleever, not as an Officer*^f. *Pos. 12.* have you *clearly manifested* that *Col. 4. 17.* proves the Churches power to censure her Officers, when the best Arguments you bring to prove *Archippus* his faultinesse (without which it was no censure) amounts but to a *strong presumption*^g, and that you know is a weak proof. So *Pos. 2.* have you *clearly manifested* from *Adams* family, that *seven, eight or nine, make a Church*, when for any thing you

Answer,

d P. 105.

e Pag. 7.
ult.f Pa. 93.
l. 1.g Pa. 59.
l. 14.

Answer, *Adams* family was no more a Church when they were seven or eight, then when they were but two or three, and do acknowledge (notwithstanding your clear manifestation) that *God hath not precisely determined what number doth make a Church* ^h. Also methinks you have not manifestly cleared, that *Revel 8. 8, 9. is sufficient and full of power* against settled endowments in the Church; of which Text you say *Our brethren present their Exposition, as probable; they force the Interpretation upon no man.* And *Pos. 7.* you do not manifestly clear that *2 Cor. 8. 5.* doth pertinently and powerfully prove, that *every Member at his admission, doth promise to give himself* ⁱ *to the Church to be guided by them,* when you say *The practice of the Churches of Macedonia by way of allusion* is made use of; and the *Argument is a comparatis* ^k: For you know ⁱ *Allusions and Comparisons are not Argumentative.* ^{l. 12.} And *Pos. 13.* instead of clear manifestation of Ministers maintenance out of the Stock of the Church, you say, *We think we see most warrant for it from the New Testament; and as most probable once disputed it; but neither then nor now are we peremptory in it* ^{l. 18.} ^{l. 18.} Finally, to omit more instances, when you say, *We think, We conceive it is probable, &c.* or do never so confidently assert any of the several Positions, and do not prove the same by the several Texts respectively alleaged, nor clear the said Texts from all the Objections made against your Exposition (one material Objection unanswered, being enough to invalidate the same) you afford so many Arguments to any wise Reader, that you have not clearly manifested the Positions and Scriptures (where

such speeches are found) to be sufficient, &c.

As for your pretending to prove some Positions and Practises by other Scriptures and Arguments (which makes your Book swell so big :) Suppose you should really so prove them, yet that (as to mine intent expressed in the *Preface*) is but a *by-matter*; For Positions and Practises may be true and lawful, and yet not truely nor lawfully grounded on the Texts alleaged; and if I answer them, and you produce other new ones, we shall contend in *infinitum*, and not come to any issue. I could wish we might keep close to the Scriptures and Positions alleaged, till they be one way or other cleared, and then we may more safely and orderly proceed to other Scriptures and Arguments.

If the Positions and Scriptures be so clearly sufficient, why do you not directly Answer the Examination, but obliquely and evadingly, in sundry places? For instance, in the very first words of your first *Reply*, when I alleage one thing, *viz. That the Apostles never taught or practised, to gather or separate one part of this true Church, and another part of that (especially persons which themselves converted not) to make a purer Church*: You answer of another thing, which was never denied. *viz. The Apostles both taught and practised the separating of some Jews from other Jews, and gathered them into a Christian Church, while yet the Jewish Church (you say) was not dissolved, but was a Church of God.*

But suppose you did solidly prove that the Church of the Jews was then a true Church: Yet first it was *not a Christian Church*, nor are the *Reformed Churches*.

The Epistle.

I 2

Churches and Ministers to be compared to the then *Jewish Church* and the *Priests* thereof, and you should prove Separation from a *Christian Church*.

Secondly, It was but one Church, and you should shew gathering out of *several Churches*.

Thirdly, It was onely of those Jews which they converted to *Christianity* from *unconverted Jews*; and you should shew the gathering of *Christians converted by others* from other *Christians converted*, as well as they, and (possibly) from those persons by whom they were converted.

Fourthly, That Church was then by Gods Commandment to be dissolved, and many Churches to be built upon its ruines; and therefore doth no more warrant the building of one *Christian Church* upon the ruine of other true *Christian Churches*, then the Parliaments Commission (if there were such a one) to the Inhabitants of *Derby Hundred* to take down *Latham house* to build them houses of, doth warrant any one of the said Inhabitants to take as many good stones as he can come by out of this, that, and the other Neighbours houses, concerning which they gave no such commandment: Your not bringing a more punctual and pertinent proof, argues either an implicate confession of the Truth of my Answer, or inability to oppugne it. A little after you discover too much willingnesse to quarrel at my Expressions, wherein you say *I would suggest* that you make Opposition to Magistracy. But doth not Master *Weld* a Congregational man, when Master *Rathband* chargeth Independents to hold that *Christians may and ought to set up new Churches*,
B 2

Pag. 6.
l. 20, 25.

The Epistle.

Churches, and practise in them all Gods Ordinances, without the consent of a Christian state, yea, against their peremptory commands and established Laws, and in the midst, and against the minde of such Churches as they freely acknowledge the true Churches of God, say of this Article, No Pen can expresse a greater latitude of Opposition against Magistracy, and Laws, and Churches too, then he affirms to be in us. Do not I use his own words? Print them in a different Character, cite him in the Margent? (which citation you (for what ends you know best) leave out as you do many others) should you not blame Master Weld, or your selves, rather then me? This is but one example of many.

And whereas according to rule and reason, he that affirms that such a Scripture holds forth such a Position, must prove it: You have a faculty, and make much use of it, when I shew you where the proof of the Position from the Text alleaged is defective, and require you to supply that defect, to turn it over to me to prove the contrary: As 1 Cor. 16.1. when I say the Churches of *Galatia* might for ought you alleage to the contrary, be combined one to another. The substance of your Answer to this passage is, *Without proof we cannot grant them (id est, Combinations of Churches) in Galatia:* And (that you may more plausibly put the businesse off your selves) you leave out the words, *For ought you alleage to the contrary.*

Finally, because charges of you for your indirect dealings without instances to make them good, are but weak; and Instances of the several kindes
would

would too much enlarge this Epistle, I will now omit them.

And yet one thing being a great wrong to me, and to the Truth of God, I cannot passe by, viz. That you oftentimes curtail and clip my Answers and Arguments, not onely the Supplement (which yet in a large Answer to a little Book in a Twelve-moneths time, is scarce allowable) being in my close stile very little; but also part of the substance and strength of them, sometimes folding them up in obscure, &c. where (you know) they cannot be read, sometimes omitting them with a censure (as the seven particulars in *Pos. 24.*) lest the Reader (had you transcribed them) should have expected an Answer, sometimes not giving any hint or intimation of any thing omitted: For example, to omit the other places (for if they were all transcribed, they would augment this Epistle in sundry pages, though my whole Examination (your Positions deducted) scarcely amounts to thirteen Leaves.) Out of my Examination of *Pos. 6.* a main passage, viz. *Gods Covenanting with Abraham, did not impose nor suppose an expresse vocal Covenant on Abrahams part, &c.* And out of my Examination of *Pos. 7.* the principal part of my Answer, *It is not said that they gave themselves to the Church or Churches, but to us, viz. Paul and Timothy, &c.* And out of my Examination, *Pos. 22.* my whole Answer to *Revel. 4. 14.* are by an *Index Expurgatorius* quite blotted out.

Brethren, let me with love and meeknesse reason with you; Do not you when you finde the shadow of such dealing in me, much complain of it? Is it not one

The Epistle.

errour under the Sun (and a great one too) in men, and perhaps in some good men, that they will strive for victory rather than truth? Do not you omit that which you know to be pertinent, while you transcribe, and largely Answer some thing lesse pertinent? You know many will read your Reply, that possibly will never see my Answer; and would you make them to beleieve that to those Scriptures alleaged in the Position, and published by my self, I should Answer either nothing at all, or no more, or otherwise then you set them down, that they may account me not onely weak (as I am) but ridiculous? Is this the fault of the Printer (who hath committed few other *Errata's*, and left out I suppose none of your Reply) or is it your fault, who say in your Epistle, *You think I will confesse your candor?* Surely, Either the Printer or the Publisher, have not delt kindly, nor candidly, but deceitfully with me, and the Reader. Cannot your cause or some particular of it, be maintained without such dealing? Is this the way to *clear manifestly the Positions and Scriptures to be sufficient, pertinent, and full of power*, by leaving out the Examination of them in whole or in part?

Thus I have signified unto you *some of those plain things*, which at the first reading of your Book appeared to me; and have also sent you some *Queres* prepared, and shewed to some of your Brethren, and (possibly) to one, or both of you, before the coming out of your Reply, and little altered since, beseeching you to hold out your way (as (you say) you are able) by giving not subtile onely, but solid scriptural or Rational Answers to them all, as they respectively

The Epistle.

15

respectively do require, and not to take and leave where you list, nor (seeing you know *Quæstio quæstionem non solvit*) to return Antiqueries (much lesse censures) instead of Answers, which notwithstanding if you shall do, I shall, if God thereunto assist, and his cause and the necessity of the Church do require, endeavour to Answer (when you have first answered these Queres) as also rejoyne to your Reply (and that within the time Geometrically proportionable to the time you took in Replying) with more mildnesse, clearnesse, and candor, then you (as by this short Epistle every wise Reader will easily see) have used in your Book.

The God of Truth, and Peace,
be with you, and your
loving Brother.

R. H.

November 29. 1645.

Some



Some *Quere's* mildly and modestly propounded to such as affect the Congregational-way.



Hether to be wise, and holy, above or without the Rule, be not folly, prophanenesse, and presumption?

Are not unscriptural wayes of procuring and preterving Church-purity, as bad as voluntary humility and will-worship?

Are not humane inventions in Gods worship, imposed by a Congregation upon her Members, or freely observed by them, as opposite to the second Commandment (at leastwise in respect of the things themselves) as if the Parliament or Assembly, had imposed or should impose or observe them?

Are not such humane inventions as are unjustly pretended to be Gods Ordinances, so much the more detestable to God and godly wise men, and more unlawful to be submitted to, then if they were plainly professed and practised as Institutions of the Church? Was not Episcopacy the worse when *Fus Divinum* was stamped on it?

Whether profession and practice of humane inventions, as a part of Gods Worship, or as essential to a Church, a Minister, or Church-Member, was not formerly esteemed, and asserted to be; and is it not still Antichristian impiety, and much liker to procure Gods judgements on the Kingdom, then the discovery, confutation, and opposition of them?

Whether they which in opposition to Presbyterial Government, the Government of the most, and best Reformed Churches, make Disturbance, Divisions, Separations, pretending their way is the Scriptural-way, the onely way, must not have as clear, yea, more clear
Scriptures

Scriptures for their way, then the other, or else be justly accounted enemies to Truth and Peace?

Doth the Scripture require the *new Constitution* of any true Churches, (such as the *Reformed Churches* are confessed to be,) and which already by your confession, have the essence of Constitution, and where doth it require it?

May not the said Churches be fully reformed according to Gods Word without a *new Constitution*?

Doth the Scripture use the phrase *gathering the Church*, in the sense that you use it, for the *first Constitution* or *Coalition* of a Church?

By what name or names, is the said *Church Constitution* so much urged upon tender consciences, called in Scripture?

Did the Apostles or Ministers in those dayes teach or practise, to gather or separate one part of this true Church (of the Jewish Church I speak not, which was then by Gods Commandment to be dissolved) and another part of that, yea, persons which themselves converted not to make out of them all a purer Church?

Did they sever the godly into bodies distinct from others of the same place, professing the same Religion?

Is it not the Scriptural-way of purging a corrupt Church, to cast out the grossest offenders first (as the Church of *Corinth* in which were many *Schismatikes*, *Heretikes*, *Fornicators*, *Drunken Communicants*, was advised to cast out the incestuous person) that others may hear and fear, &c. And so in case of Heresie and Errour, *Gal. 5.* and *6.* First, the Seducers were to be cut off; and they that were overtaken with a fault, to be restored with the spirit of meeknesse?

Doth not the setting up of a Church in a Church, and extracting the one out of the other, or out of Churches, imply the incorrigiblenesse, incurablenesse, dissolving and disanulling of that Church or Churches, out of which it is extracted?

Doth meer Separation of Members from a confessed true Church, and Ministry endeavouring to reform according to her Light, without their admonition, assistance in the Work of Reformation, or so much as intimation to the Ministers or Members, free their consciences from the guilt of those corruptions which they judge to be in that Church? Is it not a neglect of Christs rule, viz. *Admonition*, Tell him his fault, &c. And the substitution of another in the place, viz. *Separation*, which is as it were an Excommunication of the Church, and beyond the Rule?

Whether if seven, eight, nine, ten, twenty, separating voluntarily, yea, sinfully (as if they turn *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, *Familists*, *Antinomians*, *Arminians*) from a Congregation of an hundred, two hundred,

or a thousand, do by a particular Covenant combine themselves together, are presently thereupon exempt from the Jurisdiction of that Church, and have as much or more Church power, then they had while they were (as they ought still to have been) Members of the said Church, yea, do become a distinct Independent sister Church?

Whether *Women* (at least Widows and Maids, that are *sui juris*) be not engaged to seek the participation of all Gods Ordinances; as well as men, and bound to joyn in Church-Covenant, whether any considerable number of men, or any men at all do joyn with them or no?

Had *Paul* converted those *Women* to whom he preached, *Acts* 16. 13. which could not be brought into an Organical Congregation: can it be conceived that they (though Baptized) were still *without*? were not their children *also* *holy*, having right to Baptism?

If it be essential, that the Church should be at first made up of *visible Saints*; can a man in Faith joyn to any Church, or being joyned, bear Office, submit to Censures, or give any Church respect unto her, at the Constitution whereof he was not present, nor knoweth the first Members, or possibly suspecteth them to be unsound, seeing he may well doubt, whether *the said Church hath all the Essentials of a Church*, or no?

Is not that which was once Essential to a true Church ever Essential? and is not the matter of a Church, *visible Saints*, as necessary in the continuation, as in the first constitution of it?

Was every Member at his admission into the Church in the Apostles times, called to give account of the Work of Grace in his heart? and how is that proved?

Was the Congregation to judge, and what Congregation in Scripture did so judge whether that work was wrought in his heart or no; and consequently, whether he were to be admitted, or no?

Did *John Baptist*, which Baptized *Jerusalem*, and all *Judea*, yea, those which he calls *Generations of Vipers*, *Luke* 3. 7. with 21. and the Disciples of Christ which Baptized more Disciples than *John*, so much mistake (though they were born and lived amongst them) as to think every of them a true Saint of God? Was this grosse mistake the ground of their Baptizing so many of them? Did they prophane or prostitute the Holy Virgin Ordinance of Baptism in baptizing so many thousands, yea, myriads (for they could be no lesse) amongst whom were so few (very few comparatively,) either real or visible Saints? Should they not have prepared the people better then thus, and letten them have walked sometime in fellowship with them for approbation of their Conversation? for so the very Cells of Satan (say some) *Monasteries* and *Nunneries*, do before they admit any into their Society?

Was

Was not the first (if not the onely) Church, founded by Christ himself, *domestical* in Christ's own Family (as the first Jewish Church was in Abraham's Family,) in which, Christ himself, the Master of the house, who chose the Apostles and not they him, was the Priest, Prophet, and Pastour, (as also Adam, Noah, Abraham, in their Families) and in which, the Sacrament was administred and received (which we read not in other Families, called Churches;) and to which, Christ might have added many formerly converted by himself and others, and yet did not; and should or may a family of twelve or thirteen be, and continue so long an entire Church, without adding one Member of any other family (though never so fit to be received) as Christs Family till it was dissolved by his death did?

Whether the Church being first *Domestical* and after *Congregational*, both the one, and the other, were not accidental to it (the Jewish Church having the essence of a Church when it was National, as well as while it was Congregational) and to the Office of an Apostle, then the onely Church Officer (seeing (themselves say) an Officer and a Church, an Universal Officer and Universal Church, are Relatives) as it is accidental to a General to have but one Company or one Regiment?

Whether Subordination of Ecclesiastical Judicatories, and the benefit of Appeals in the Old Testament, was meerly Ceremonial (though the High Priest, Temple, and some other things were) or was it grounded on natural Reason and Equity? and so far as it is so grounded, is it abrogated in the New Testament? and how doth the abrogation of it appear?

Doth not 1 Cor. 12. 28. warrant an *Universal visible Church*, name, and thing, seeing it is improper to say That the Apostles which by Office had the care of all Churches, were set, put, or placed in any one? If they were Members of any particular Church, was it not rather of Jerusalem then of Corinth (to which, Paul did but come as to other Churches; and no other Apostle that we read of was there; and which at his Baptism was a meer *non-ens*; much lesse were the Jews and Gentiles Baptized into the Corinthian Church)? Is not Paul's speech, *Ye are the Body of Christ*, corrective of it self; *ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος*, as if he should say, *Ye are not the whole Body, but members in part of that Body*, in which, the Jewish and Gentilish Churches are said to be Heb. 13. 3. Ephes 3. 6. Whereof Paul was a Minister, Colos. 1. 15. viz. The Catholike visible Church?

Is not this Body or Church Catholike *totum integrale*, and the particular Churches *similares parte*? Doth not the Scripture usually set it down as *one Spouse, one Woman travelling, one Assembly of twenty four*

Elders, and four Beasts, one City of God, one Household, one Temple, (whereof the Church of Ephesus (being not the whole City, Household, or Temple,) were fellow Citizens, of the Household, and built together, viz. With other Churches and Children of God). one new Jerusalem, &c. The Scripture not warranting the expression of an hundred or a thousand Cities of God, New Jerusalem, &c?

Doth not the Scripture expressly, and almost in the same words teach, That the Sacraments, Officers, and Censures, belong primarily to the Catholike visible Church, when it saith, *We are all Baptized into it, and in it God hath set not onely extraordinary persons, callings, gifts, as Apostles, Prophets, &c. but ordinary as Teachers* (there is the same reason of *Pastors*,) *Helps, Governments*, in which the Censures are included?

If the Scripture allow the name and thing of an Universal visible Church: If also the Jewish Christian Churches be called in Scripture, *one Bride, one new Jerusalem*, and all the Gentiles Churches *one Sister*, and all the Jews and Gentiles converted *one sheepfold under one Shepherd*; may not all the Churches in a Nation, living under one Civil Government, agreeing in one Confession of Faith, and Directory for Worship, joyned in one Covenant, and represented sometimes in one Assembly of themselves, or their Messengers, be by warrant of Scripture called *one Church*?

Whether though National Churches were as lawful as either Domesticall or Congregational, There was in the Apostolike times any possibility of having a National Church when there was no Christian Magistrate, (which we now esteem a special blessing,) nor were Christians so many as to bear the name of a Land or Nation (as if but one Family had been Christian, the Church could not have been more then Domesticall) nor had they liberty, safely and freely to meet in National Synods or Assemblies (which yet we now hold lawful and useful Ordinances of God.) Could the Protestant Church be National in the dayes of *Henry the eighth, and Queen Mary*, as it was in the dayes of *King Edward, and Queen Elizabeth*?

Whether can a wise impartial man, which reads and considers the wonderful operations of the Sermons of *John Baptist, Jesus Christ, the twelve Apostles, and the seventy Disciples*, conceive that the one hundred and twenty, *Acts 1.* were the total number of the Christians, in *Jerusalem* (among whom, were the eleven and the seventy) or the major part of them?

Whether it be possible or probable, that all those of *Jerusalem* which were converted and Baptized before the death of Christ, *Math. 3. 19. 5. 6. John 4. 12. and 12. 19. Luke 10. 17, 18.* together with those several thousands

thousands converted to Christianity by Peter, Acts 2, &c. might notwithstanding their numbers, joyn in Publike Prayer, and Preaching, so that all might hear, and all might be edified?

Whether doth any Scripture shew, that the many thousands confessed to be of the Church of Jerusalem, did meet ordinarily together to receive the Lords Supper (the chief Church Ordinance?) Can it be imagined, that so many at once could be accommodated with room, Beds to sit, lye, or lean upon, (as Christ did according to the custome of those times) a Table to receive at, and Cups to drink in, especially seeing that though they continued with one accord in the Temple, yet they brake Bread from house to house, (the Jews probably not permitting this new Ordinance in the Temple;) viz. In the severall houses of those poor that then received the Gospel?

Can it be shewed that any Church in a City, or Town, how numerous soever it grew, was for the numerosity of it, divided into two or more Churches (I speak of Ecclesiastical Judicatories, not of Congregations) or that there were for that reason more Churches then one, in any one City or Town, and by what Scripture?

Do not places in Scripture denominate Churches? Were not all the beleiving *Corinthians* of the Church of Corinth; the Brethren that were in *Laodicea* of the Church of *Laodicea*; the Saints in *Ephesus*; the Church of *Ephesus*, &c? And each of them under the Jurisdiction respectively of Corinth, *Laodicea*, and *Ephesus*, &c? Is not this a patern uncontrolled by precepts and other paterns? Is there any example or warrant in Scripture; That a Christian living in a Town or City where there was a Church, was not, nor ought to be a member of that Church, but of a remoter Church?

Did not Pastors in Scripture feed the flock of God that was amongst them? or can they watch over their flocks, or Church members one over another, as by Covenant they are bound, if they live five, ten, fifteen, twenty miles a sunder?

Can it be shewed that God in the Old or New Testament, did erect one Church without Officers? Seeing Adam was a Priest to his Wife and Family, and the first born afterwards were Priests at the founding of the Jewish Church, and Christ was an Officer to the Church in his house, and the Apostles were Officers in commission at the founding of the Christian Churches?

Hath a Church without an Elder, or with one onely, and consequently no *Presbytery*, power to censure, yea, excommunicate? Can an Instance be given of any such incompleat Church that did exercise any Church Government? Or can it be proved by Scripture, that they might and ought to have exercised it?

Doth not Election of, and Submission to the same Officers and Ministry, ordinarily frequenting the same Ordinances and Worship, joynt maintenance of Officers and Ordinances (not to speak how considerable Cohabitation and private Christian Communion is) include a sufficient, though an *implicite* covenant or consent, which may be justified by holy Writ?

Whether there be any Precept, direct or indirect, or President at the founding of the first Churches, for a *solemn expresse verbal Covenant or Agreement*, more explicate then this? and if not, are not they guilty (to say no more) of strange boldnesse, which make it not onely lawful, but useful, and far better then the said *implicite Covenant*, yea, a binding Ordinance of God, necessary, if not to the being, yet to the *welbeing, strength and purity of the Church*?

Whether there be a Church Covenant in Scripture (*viz.* which not onely in general promiseth Service and Obedience. but hath also special relation to *Church State*, and *Church Members* duties as such, as marriage Covenant hath to conjugal duties as such?)

May not the Scripture Covenants, *viz.* God shall be our God, &c. be taken by two or three, though too few to make a Church; or by one Family, or by persons of several Churches, and yet leave them in the state they were in, and not make them Members of a distinct Church, as *Independents* Covenants are said to do?

Whether Subscription to your Confession of Faith, be as essentially necessary to Church Constitution, as entering into Covenant? Is your Confession the very same with the Confessions of other *Independent Churches*, or a Different? Is the Confession of your later Churches, the very same with the Confession of your former Churches? Do your selves esteem all things therein unquestionable Fundamental Articles of Faith, seeing you require Subscription to them all alike, as a Confession of Faith, and that upon pain of Non-Admission?

Whether there be any Precept or President in Scripture for requiring a Promise, before we admit Members, that they will not depart without the Churches leave? Is this a standing Ordinance, or but a Politique invention, requisite for the good of Societies so moulded? Are not Church Members Liberties much infringed, when they can neither dispose of themselves, or their children in Service, Marriage, and Factorship, remote from that Church, without discovering the causes them thereunto moving, (which is not alway fit and safe to be done,) and having Approbation and Dismission from her, which sometimes is hard to be got, especially for rich and useful Members?

Whether any Apostle or other in the Primitive times, did refuse to admit

admit any known believer to the Sacrament, because he was not (to use the new phrase of these times) in *Church-state*, or that they enquired of him whether he was covenanted into some particular Congregation, and that such a one as they might lawfully hold Communion with?

Was the Baptism of *John*, and of the Disciples, and Apostles of Christ, a Seal of Congregation Communion? Was *Paul* the Apostle, and the Eunuch, Baptized into a particular Congregation? did not the ordinary Pastors of *Corinth* Administer that one Baptism, and Baptize in the same Body that *John* Baptist did, and that *Paul* Baptized *Crispus* and *Gaius*, and the household of *Stephanas* into? Is Baptism one time a Seal principally of Congregational Communion, and other times not? and what Scripture is there to warrant such a distinction?

Whether every Congregation which joyns in Covenant, doth, or must consist of all, or some Christians able to try the sufficiency of an Elder, yea, fit to discharge that Office? Or, whether visible Sanctity without such ability, be not sufficient? And may this Congregation lawfully, (without assistance of others, unless themselves please,) notwithstanding their apparent inability, chuse their own Minister; and that one of themselves also which must needs be an Insufficient one?

May this Congregation also (suppose they had a godly learned Pastor) proceed against him in case of Errour and Heresie, even to Deposition and Excommunication, if their weaknesse shall judge it fit? And is the said Deposition valid (whether just and unjust) unlessse the said Church be pleased to recal it, to deprive the said Pastor of his Ministerial Authority and Office; and is there no remedy in such a case?

Is it not improper to call them that *rule only*, by the name of *Elders*; and them that both rule and labour in the Word and Doctrine, by a meaner name, *Ministers*? Doth the Scripture apply the name of *Elders*, rather to Ruling then to Preaching Elders; and if it doth not, why should we?

Are the Ministers in the New Testament called *Διάκονοι* or *ὑπηρεταί* τῆς λαοῦ or τῆς Εκκλησίας: The Ministers or Deacons of the Church, or of the people? Are they not usually called Ministers of the Lord, of God, of Christ, of the New Testament, of the Gospel, of the Word, &c? and with reference to their people, Elders, Rulers, Pastors, Teachers, Overseers; Ministers for them, &c? Doth that Expression in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. 4. Verſ. 5. *Our selves your servants* (where-with Paul call himself as well as others; imply, that he received his Authority and Office from the Church, did Officiate in their names,

was censurable by them, as a servant by his Master; or that he made himself a servant to them, as Christ did to his Disciples, and as all good Ministers do to their Flocks for their good?

Are the *Spirits of the Prophets* subject to the people, or to the Prophets? Is not this subjection of the Spirits of the Prophets, to the Prophets, viz. Of the fewer to the greater number, as well in Synods and Assemblies of Churches, or of their Messengers, as in particular Congregations?

Whether these two Propositions [*Synods or Assemblies of Churches, or of their Messengers* (to say nothing now of their jurisdiction) are Gods Ordinances,] and [*Every particular Congregation may, yea, must enjoy all Gods Ordinances within it self*] be not crosse and contrary one to another, or how are they reconciled according to Scripture grounds?

Is it any priviledge for Congregations to subsist every one by her self? May they not stand and flourish surer and better in an holy and Brotherly combination, and coordinate subjection, then in a divided singularity?

Doth not Communion of particular Churches require, and the light of nature, and the equity of Scripture rules, and examples teach, that they may, and ought to enter into mutual Consociation or Confederation amongst themselves; in Classes and Synods, that they may so far as conveniently can be, make use of common consent and mutual assistance, especially in those things that are of greater moment?

If the Keyes be given to Beleevers to be exercised by them as Beleevers, then are they not given to all beleevers; whether in Church Covenant or no, Church Members or no? If they be given to Church Members as such, doth it not then follow, that *Pastors as Pastors, or Elders as Elders*, have no more power of the Keyes then other Church Members? And may not women as Church Members challenge power and right in them, do they not challenge the same in some of the new Congregations?

Is not investing Non-Elders with Ministerial power, placing the power of the Keys in the Body of the Congregation, and complaining of the Elders that rule well, for taking too much upon them, the sin of *Corah*? Is it not a sin of the New, as well as of the Old Testament? Doth *Jude* Historically or Prophetically speak of it? If Prophetically? When, and in whom is it, or shall be fulfilled?

Doth Election without Ordination make the Officer? Were the seven chosen by the people, *Acts 6*. Officers by vertue of their Election, before the Apostles prayed and imposed hands? If so, then did not the people rather then the Apostles appoint them over the businesse?

If Ordination be lesse then Election, then why is *laying on of hands*, rather then lifting up of hands in suffrages, reckoned amongst the Principles,

Principles, Heb. 6 ? Why is the charge more expresse, that Ordination (rather than Election) should not be suddenly and hastily made ? Why is the description of persons to be ordained much more large in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* which were to ordain, than of persons to be elected in any or all the Epistles written to the Churches to whom such election is conceived to belong ?

Is Ordination of Ministers an act of *Presbyterian* power, or of Church-liberty ?

Did the Apostles (which you confesse (a) did wherever they came, leave the Elders and people to the exercise of that right which belonged to them) invest non-Elders with the power of Ordaining ?

Did not Churches wait, and not ordain their own Elders ? (though they had as much Authority, and knew it as well as Churches now do)

Did not the Apostles go themselves to ordain Elders in every Church, or send some Elders or other to that purpose ?

Doth the Scripture require that every particular Congregation may, yea must (though she hath neighbour Congregations to assist, which is our case) alone ordain her own Elders ?

What one Elder in Scripture was ordained by those that were onely of that particular Congregation where he was to officiate ?

What may be the reason that the Apostle (which did all things fitly) writing to so many Churches (in each of which was a particular Eldership) did not so largely (if at all) set down Rules for Ordination as in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* ?

Did the Presbytery that ordained *Timothy*, consist onely of one particular Congregation ? and of what Congregation ? and how is it proved ?

Was not every Apostle (as also *Timothy* and *Titus*) as it were an Eldership of the Churches extraordinarily combined in one man ?

When the Apostles joyned with other Elders in Ordination, under what notion did they joyn ? as Elders of sundry Churches, or onely as Co-elders of that particular Congregation ? If under the later notion, what did they adde unto them ; the Elders of a Church, being but Three or Four, having as much power as if by addition of Two or Three they were made Five or Six ?

May we not grant in some cases that *Supreme Civil* power (suppose in executing one that had murdered his father and attempted to murder his mother) as well as *Ecclesiastical* may be exercised in one Congregation, yea, in one family (if it be in a wilderness, when it can have no assistance in Government) without having the least thought that in ordinary cases every Congregation or Family ought to be Independent in Ecclesiastical or Civil matters ?

Ordinary Elders imposing hands on Apostles or Apostolike men, as you say the Teachers of *Antioch* ordained *Paul* an Apostle, *Act. 13. 1, 2*, did they set him apart to officiate onely in one, their own Congregation, and not in other Churches? For example, not in *Rome*, to which *Paul* writing, calls himself, with reference to that Ordination, *Αποσπαστος απο των ενομων*, an Apostle separated, &c.

Is there not as many precepts or presidents for admitting to the Sacrament known Christians of no set Congregation (which you so much boggle at) as of admitting the members of other Churches and their children, which you commonly practice?

Do not Elders receive their power and commission for the whole Church of Christ, and may they not (having a Call) preach in any Congregation, administer the Sacrament to any Christian, yea, vote in any Synod, as the Scottish Divines by consent do vote in our Assembly?

Doth not communion of Churches bring communion of Offices and Officers? Else how can a Minister administer the Sacrament as an Officer (for as a gifted man, he cannot dispense it) to men of another Church, by vertue of the said communion of Churches? And if so, why may not an Elder assist a Church wanting Elders, in Ordination; or assist the Elders of other Churches in Jurisdiction?

If recommendation be as it were a dismissal (by your own Principles) differing not really, but onely in time; may not a Minister recommended, that is, dismissed for a time, act Ministerially in another Congregation? may not the Maior of one Corporation, by consent of all parties interested, act authoritatively out of the said Corporation? (as the Maior of *London* is Bayliff of *Southwark*) And may not the Colonels of *Lancashire* (your own similitudes) by like consent govern and rule the Souldiery of *Cheshire*?

Is not the whole Church of God one Corporation, one City (*us supra*)? And may not then the Aldermen and Officers, notwithstanding their severall Wards, Limits, Companies, joyn together in a Court of Common counsel for the Government of the City?

May a Pastor, as a Pastor, pray for the Universal Church, or no?

Is it a divine or but an humane Institution, that Ministers should be maintained by Lords-day collections? If humane; can any man which holds all Humane Institutions unlawful, with good conscience offer at those Collections? If you say it is divine; where is the warrant for it? Dare you determine it as certain, or do you but dispute it as probable?

Do not these Independent Ministers which enjoy Church lands, and receive Tythes or compositions for them, or yearly, half yearly, quarterly

erly stipends, hold these ways of maintenance as lawful as Lords-day-collections ?

By what Scripture prove ye that it is the duty of any Christians that are not of your Church (nor ever were) but are by you excluded out of it (possibly because they will not take your Covenant, or subscribe your Confession, or the like) to contribute to your maintenance ; seeing you take no charge of them, nor so much as preach to them as Pastors ? Have you from Christ any power to receive maintenance from such ?

May a Church, to save charges, make it a rule or constant practice to chuse no Ruling-elders, though never so fit and able, but such as are able to maintain themselves ? Doth not that Text, *1 Tim 5 17*, hold forth the maintenance (notwithstanding the poverty of those times) as well as the lawfulness of Ruling elders ?

Whether Moderators and Presidents of Synods and Church assemblies, Assessors, Scribes, and Registers of Church-proceedings (to say nothing of ringing Bells to publike Worship) be lawful and useful or no ? Are these Offices grounded on Scripture, or on Reason, or the light of Nature ?

Hath God anywhere forbidden that he that exerciseth those Offices, of Presidency or Moderatorship, &c. in one Synod, should exercise them in the next, and in the third fourth &c. while he is willing, able, faithful in discharge of his duty, and is thereunto elected and approved ?

Is not the preaching of the Word the highest and hardest part of the Ministerial Function, in respect of which, *Paul saith Who is sufficient for these things !* And if so ; by what warrant do private men unfit for the meanest Office in the Ministry, so ordinarily and presumptuously usurp it, and yet are justified by some of you ?

How dare non-Elders, which have no commission from Christ to Preach and Baptize, nor power to receive maintenance, usually and publicly preach the Word in the Congregations, and receive maintenance for the same ? Do not they themselves sin, and all they which usually hear and maintain them in their way ; especially such as may hear true Ministers as able and as faithful men as they ?

Hath not any in the Congregation (by their own grounds) as much authority to preach and receive maintenance, if the Congregation judge him gifted, and desire it ?

Doth the absence or dissent of some or of the minor part of the Congregation disannul the election of an Officer, admission, excommunication, &c. of a member, or other Church-proceedings ? or is the minor part bound to rest in the vote of the major part, though

contrary to their own judgements ? or must they separate from the Church, in case they conceive the major part doth sin in such election, admission, &c. lest they be leavened ?

Are not all bound in conscience ordinarily to hear their own Ministers, which themselves, or their husbands, or parents, or the major part of the religious in their Congregation did either elect or afterward consent and freely submit to ? (which after consent, in the case of *Leah*, was enough to make a Marriage) Or is every Christian notwithstanding this, at liberty to hear whomsoever and whensoever they please, even upon Sabbath days, when they conceive he is bound to preach ?

Were not husbands, wives and children alway of one and the same Church ? Doth the vote of the husband, or his joyning to this or that true Church include the vote and joyning of his wife and children under his Government ? Is it not then a disorderly unscriptural practice that husbands should be of one true Church, and wives (and that often without their husbands privity) of another, and children possibly of a third ? Can an example of the like be shewed ?

Can Masters of Families (in such a case) take that care that those that are under their Government do sanctifie the Sabbath, which by the moral Law of God they are obliged to take, when one go's one way, another a second, another a third ?

Whether there be any precept or president in Scripture for suspension of any member of a particular Church or Congregation from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, who is not at the same time cast out of the Church ? and where is it ?

Whether any greater degree of knowledge and sanctity ought to be required from any before we admit them to the sacrament, then Christ required of all those which he admitted to it ; if so great a degree may be required, considering what men they were, and what means they enjoyed ?

Doth the Scripture contain in it any precept, president or warrant that a man should refuse to communicate where either the Pre bytery or Congregation are remisse in Discipline, and admit such to the Sacrament as in his judgement are not fit ?

Was every particular *Corinthian* by communicating guilty of that grosse profanation of the Sacrament by the incestuous person, though in his place he (as it is like some few did) laboured to reform it, and mourned for what he could not mend ?

Is not the instance of *Achan* for *Relative* guilt, more fixable to the *Israelites* as a Camp then as a Congregation, and as valid against fighting in an Army as against communicating in an Assembly where wicked men are admitted ?

May a man under pretence that he abhorreth Idols, commit sacrilege ; that is, in Scripture phrase, rob Churches or Temples of that which belongs

belongs to them, and convert to private use things he never bought or bargain'd for (nor is the propriety of them legally in him, but in others) because he falsely conceiteth (or suppose truely) that they were at first idolatrously and superstitiously dedicated to God? Is *gain godlinesse*? Doth this Reformation favour of Conscionableness or Convetousnesse? Is there now adays any such sin as Sacriledge? and what is it?

Whether the practice of every humane Invention (suppose those mentioned in these Queres prove such) or the practice of every humane Institution used by the Papists (suppose celebrating and receiving the Lords Supper before dinner, in unleavened bread, bare headed, &c. b such) though accompanied with sincere hatred and solemn renunciation of the Papacie and Popery, be the mark of the Beast?

Can they that receive the mark of the Beast, be saved without explicate knowledge of it and particular repentance for it?

Is that the mark of the Beast in one Age, that is not in another?

Was there not both Pastors and People during all the rage and reign of Antichrist which did not receive the mark of the Beast, but their Fathers name, and were Virgins; and yet did live and die in the practice of some Traditions used by the Papists?

Can it be said either with truth or charity that the reformed Churches or Waldenses, Albigenes, &c. which were more corrupt then they, did or do receive the mark of the Beast? and who is he that can or will justify this accusation?

Whether, notwithstanding the apparent differences between the Apostolike Churches and ours; the Jewish Ceremonies being then scarce dead, or at least not buried, their Civil customs differing from ours, the Church being then but in gathering from amongst Heathens and Jews, under Heathenish and Jewish persecuting Magistrates, and endued with extraordinary gifts and offices, (which is not our case) the Rites and Ceremonies, Practices and Usages of the Apostolike times be unalterably binding to all after-ages?

Doth Christs faithfulness above Moses consist in a more particular and peculiar determination of all externals of Gods Worship in the New Testament then was given by Moses in the Old? Are the times and days of Baptism and the Eucharist as plain as the days and times of Circumcision and the Pascheover, the place of meeting, with the utensils &c?

Is the particular way how maintenance should be given to the Ministry as particularly prescribed in the New Testament as in the Old, or the place of, &c?

Where in Scripture is that glorious title of The Kingdom of Christ, applied to the external policie of the Church; and of all other ways of Church-Government, to the Congregational-way onely and chiefly;

so that no Christians (though never so sincere and holy) have Christ for their King, except they be Church-members, and also within the Congregational Covenant; or at least none so much as they? And if it be not so applied in Scripture, do not they wrong Christ his Kingdom and people, that presume so to apply it?

Did not *New England*-men well and warrantably, when their hopes began to languish of reducing the erroneous by private means, or by preaching and conference, to hold an Assembly of the Churches for discovery and confutation of them?

Had the General Court Civil in *New England* a lawful power, when *Opinions grew on*, and *experience discovered the danger*, to make a Law that Churches should not be set up in *N. E.* without the consent of the Magistrates and Churches there? And hath not the Civil power in *Old England*, from whence theirs is derived, seeing the Word of God doth not alter with Climates, the same power, when there is the same or greater occasion? And ought not obedience be yielded here as well as there?

Would not they that now plead for Liberty of Conscience and Toleration in the Kingdom, were they able to root out Presbyterians and their Way, and could Civil Authority enclinable to put forth coercive power against it, tell the Magistrate that he might (if not, he ought) repress it with a strong hand, at least under the notion of being prejudicial to the Civil peace, if it could not otherwise be suppressed?

Did not the Magistrates of *N. E.* when they saw that neither preaching, conference, nor Assembly of the Churches did work the cure of their Distractions, but the erroneous went on in their former course, not onely to disturb the Churches, but miserably also to interrupt the Civil Peace, to convent them, and to disfranchise some, fine others, and banish others? Is it true or no, that sundry speak, and some write, that our *N. E.* Brethren would not tolerate a few Presbyterians (notwithstanding the now-pretended smalnesse of the difference) which were persecuted for Nonconformity, in any corner of their Countrey; no not so much as in that which was next to the *Barbarians*?

Whether they which hold Episcopal Government to be Antichristian, Babylonish, to be destroyed by fire and sword; and also Presbyterian Government to be Antichristian, as bad or worse then Episcopal, be not bound by their principles to root out Presbyterial Government and the resolute abettors of it, with fire and sword, if they can get ability and opportunity for such a designe?

Whether they which have solemnly sworn to *endeavour the Reformation of Religion in Doctrine, Discipline, Worship and Government*, according to the Word of God and the example of the best Reformed Churches,
and

and to endeavour the *Uniformity of the Churches in the three Kingdoms*, and the extirpation of *Popery, Prelacy, Superstition, Heresie, Schism, &c.* as all Parliament-men, the Assembly, and the best affected in the Kingdom have done, can with good conscience allow or tolerate Popery, Prelacy, Superstition, Heresie Schism? and why may they not (for any obligation lying upon them by this Covenant) tolerate Popery, Prelacy and Superstition as well as Heresie and Schism?

Whether the Parliament can perform those promises they have made in the first Remonstrance, and since (wherein the Kingdom hath much confided) If they loose the golden reins of *Discipline*, and leave private men or particular Congregations to take up what form of Divine Service they please, without requiring conformity to that Order which the Laws enjoyn according to Gods Word?

Have our Brethren expressed all their present opinions and desires, or kept some for a reserve? and what may be the reason of such a reserve? Are they fully perswaded in their own mindes of the truth of all that which they expresse themselves to hold, or onely take them up for the present, waiting for further light? May not the Presbyterian-Way, for ought they certainly know (howbeit they at present think not so) be the Way of God, and most agreeable to his Word? And have not expressions to this purpose proceeded from their Tongues or Pens?



FINIS.



